The Essence of Psycho-Analysis as Opposed to What Is Secondary

Neville Symington

This paper’s purpose is to differentiate what is essential to psycho-analysis to what is actually not part of psycho-analysis at all but something peripheral that has become associated with it. The paper makes therefore a differentiation between what is secondary to psycho-analysis and what is primary.

“To regard as primary what is secondary is the ‘root of all fallacy.’” — Meister Eckhart (Kelley, 1977, p. 42)

Is what is happening in our consulting rooms psycho-analysis? To answer this we have to get at what it is and separate this from the way we often conceive of it. The fourteenth-century Christian mystic Meister Eckhart said that making primary what is secondary is the root of all fallacy (Kelley, 1977). So—is what is unfolding today in our consulting rooms psycho-analysis? I have resorted to the distinction that the philosopher, Immanuel Kant, made between the noumenon and the phenomenon. The noumenon means the substance of the thing in itself; the phenomenon means the way in which this manifests itself to a human being’s senses. The noumenon is one thing; the phenomenon is multiple. The phenomena can be many, but the principle is single. The noumenon as opposed to the phenomenon has been aptly expressed analogically by a writer who won the Nobel Prize for Literature thus: “I have noticed in my life deep resemblances between many different kinds of things. Writing a book is not unlike building a house or planning a battle or painting a picture. The technique is different, the materials are different, but the principle is the same” (Bonham Carter, 1966, p. 38).

If one thinks of psycho-analysis in this way, then the classic picture of the analyst seeing someone on the couch, for fifty minutes, five days a week, interpretation being the agent of change, and so forth, are only particular instances of a principle which has several other forms. We all know that psycho-analysis continues long after the formal process of patient visiting an analyst ceases; therefore these foci on the particulars that occur in the consulting room cannot be the heart of the matter. The phenomena are a series of manifestations of the substance of the thing. The way psycho-analysis is spoken about in seminars for students and in discussions in the IPA and EPF for what constitutes minimum standards for psycho-analysis, the question of the couch is always introduced, usually with an imperative that the patient should be invited to use it.
Also in IPA deliberations the question of how many times a week constitutes analysis is a subject for ardent discussion, sometimes acrimonious. Five times a week, four times a week, three times a week—these three options are usually accepted, although there is reluctance to accept three times a week by many. When someone said, “Why not twice a week?” an eminent psycho-analyst riposted that this was just mocking, though three times a week seemed acceptable to him. This is how psycho-analysis is thought about and its practice based upon this mode of definition. And we are all familiar with cartoons which depict a patient on the couch with the analyst sitting behind with some humorous legend beneath. I remember one where the analyst says to the patient: Of course you are depressed; I am expensive. This is the outer clothing. It is the phenomenon not the noumenon. It is secondary not primary. In this talk I am concerned to clarify what psycho-analysis is—to discover the noumenon—but I continue with other components that marry up with this first definition. I want to locate the substance of the thing. The substance of psycho-analysis is an inspiration, capable of revolutionizing our world, but what is secondary—interpretation as the agent of change, length of sessions, frequency of sessions—these are secondary and inspire no one. Many have been through this outer process and remained unanalyzed; others who have not been through this process have had very successful analyses.

In this phenomenal way of conceptualizing psycho-analysis the focus is not upon understanding but upon the instruments used to achieve that understanding. So in many a clinical paper it would seem that transference is the goal rather than an instrument we use to achieve the goal. It is the same with those other instruments: interpretation believed to be the agent of change, countertransference, projection, denial, repression, and displacement. An astronomer needs to spend time to make sure that his telescope is properly set up, but the objects of his research are the stars and planets which the telescope helps him to see better. These analytic instruments just mentioned are equivalents to the telescope. The goal of psycho-analysis is to see the inner world of the two participants. The telescope needs to be in good order so we can see clearly, but it is not to be worshipped as an end in itself.

I finished what I will call my “formal” analysis thirty-five years ago but I have been in analysis ever since. By “formal” analysis I mean visiting an analyst five times a week, forty weeks a year for several years. The “analysis ever since” which I call my “true analysis” occurs internally within me and externally in relation to significant people. These people are alive to me and keep the analysis alive. These people may be physically dead but very alive to my heart. Let me tell you about one such person: the English writer George Eliot. I was reading her novel Middlemarch while on holiday in Spain twenty-seven years ago and came to the passage describing the marriage between Lydgate and Rosamund. Rosamund was a femme fatale, and Lydgate realized that his wife no longer loved him. Then George Eliot (1973, p. 702) says the following:

The first great disappointment must be borne: the tender devotedness and docile adoration of the ideal wife must be renounced, and life must be taken up on a lower stage of expectation, as it is by men who have lost their limbs. But the real wife had not only her claims, she had still a hold on his heart, and it was his intense desire that the hold should remain strong. In marriage, the certainty, “She will never love me much”, is easier to bear than the fear, “I shall love her no more.” Hence … his inward effort was entirely to excuse her, and to blame the hard circumstances which were partly his fault. (p. 702)

This opened up an understanding for me at the time: that it was a greater
disaster to cease to love than the pain of not being loved anymore. George Eliot was alive to me at that moment.
My relation to her bore fruit in a new understanding of the mind, of the spirit. My emotional life was enriched. This is one example, and down the years there have been many, many others. This is the true analysis of which the "formal" analysis was the gateway opening this new channel of revelation. Today, I can say every day, a new understanding develops for me. I am in analysis. I am saying this to emphasize that this analysis is conducted without "an analyst," without what would be recognized as an interpretation, without a couch (although I was lying on a sofa at the four in the morning when I first read the passage I have just quoted), with no fifty-minute sessions. So all these do not constitute the substance of analysis. They are secondary. What is primary, what makes an analysis, is a relationship which fertilizes into understanding. This is the analysis.

I will give another example. In 1979 I was reading a series of essays by Isaiah Berlin that were published in his book Against the Current. The focus in the essays in this book is upon those European thinkers who went against the tide, against the fashion of thought current at the time. One such thinker whom he discusses is Giambattista Vico, who was a philologist who taught in the University of Naples in the seventeenth and eighteenth century. Vico started by being a faithful disciple of Descartes, who taught that we know best the natural world. But then Vico slid away from Descartes and the whole Enlightenment belief that it is only the natural world and its principles that can be faithfully known whereas man's own artifacts cannot be known with the same certainty as our knowledge of the natural world. Something happened inside of Vico, and whatever it was that made an upheaval in his heart he suddenly said, "No, Descartes is wrong—we know best what we have ourselves created." This was absolutely mind-blowing when I read it back in 1979. First: what I read had complete conviction for me. It seemed a simple statement but one that seemed so obvious that to refute it seemed absurd. If a photographer and a painter sat down in front of a lake, surrounded by trees with some sheep and cows in a field to the left of the lake, and the photographer clicked his machine and the painter then drew colors from his palette to create the reflection of the trees with the differing light and the whole process took him five hours I felt sure that the painter rather than the photographer knew that piece of landscape better than the photographer. I was, at the time of reading this book of Isaiah Berlin's, staying on the coast near Port Phillip Bay south of Melbourne in Australia and per chance spending some time painting different seascapes and I knew that what I was seeing when I was creating through painting was known much better than when, on a previous occasion, I had clicked the camera. So this statement of Vico's was a revolution in my mind. My mind would never be the same again. So, shortly after this upheaval of the mind, the thought came to me very quickly that if I can only truly know that which I have created, then if the aim of psycho-analysis is to know myself which I believe is its essence then to know myself I had to create myself—that there were events in my life that were lying there dead in my mind and that I needed to create them if I were truly to know them. Later this insight illuminated Bion's formulation of alpha function, which I understood was this creative factor which Vico had taught me in so arresting a fashion. So, for instance, a woman who had been in the formal modality of analysis for five years one day said that when she was a four-year-old child her mother used to beat her with a cricket bat. This had been there as a piece of dead knowledge but now she was aware of it. She said, "I have always known this but now I know that I know." So an activity had occurred that transformed knowledge into awareness. The source of this activity is not known directly, and this is why Bion posited alpha function as a hypothesis. Alpha function is the creative principle to which Vico had been alluding. I realized that Bion had a long series of previous mentors down the
corridor of history.
So these are two examples of an analysis in progress. Both of these understandings were not just intellectual, because they transformed the whole direction of my emotional life. The latter event, let me call it the Vico insight, occurred two years after my formal analysis had finished. The former occurred some five or six years after.

I want now to relate an interpretation that revolutionized my life while I was in “formal analysis.” I had just started taking on psychotherapy patients. A man, a teacher, was referred to me, and in the assessment he agreed to come to see me twice a week. He had had several other therapies previously. Then, shortly after the assessment, he rang and told me that he wanted only to come once a week. I related this to my analyst, saying that I thought this man did not have commitment to the treatment. My analyst said, “He will probably come to see you for a while, then bugger off, perhaps go and see someone else or maybe ask to come back to you …” I said, “Well that’s not very good, is it?” and he replied, “It is his life not yours.” That had a fantastic effect on me. That man was not my possession, not the plaything of my cherished theories; he did not belong to me. This intervention of my analyst tuned into a deep regard for the freedom of the individual and I came to think that often I project my own “way of being” into the theory or school of thinking of another, whether it be that of Freud, of Jung, of Klein, of Kohut, of Winnicott or … whomever.

I have given three psychic events that have revolutionized my thinking: two of them outside “formal analysis” and one within “formal analysis.” They were all events of analysis. When I say that they have revolutionized my thinking it is not just thinking but my emotional way of being toward my wife, my sons, my friends, and with you here, my audience. So the substance of psycho-analysis lies in a relationship which transforms the inner emotional direction of life whose fruit is a new understanding of the world.

Some years ago I had this conversation with an elderly colleague. He told me that he had had his formal training analysis forty years earlier.

“My analysis finished fifteen years ago but my real analysis only started ten years ago.”

“What, you mean it only started five years after your analysis finished?”

“Yes, my real analysis only started five years after I had stopped visiting my analyst.”

“What do you mean by real analysis?” I asked.

“It was when I became aware that I had been mad.”

“You mean you were mad when you were in analysis, visiting your analyst, but did not know it?”

“I knew it but was not aware of it,” he replied mysteriously.

“Could you say a bit more about what you mean by awareness? I sense that you seem to differentiate between knowing something and being aware of something.”

He then gave me the following explanation. He told me that when he had been in formal analysis he had been married to a woman who was mad. He told me that his analyst had once said to him, “You have married a mad woman,” but he was still not aware that he was married to a mad woman.
“You mean,” I said, “that you were not aware of it although your analyst had told you that you had married a man woman?” sounding a bit incredulous.

“Yes,” he said, “my analyst telling me did not foster awareness in me.”

I was at that time very puzzled by this exchange with my elderly colleague, but then I had the following experience with a patient many years later. This patient used to start every session, five days a week, by saying to me:

“You know, doctor, I am very guilty about sexual things.”

And one thing I might have been sure of was that he knew he was guilty about sexual things. But then one day he came in and said to me:

“You know, doctor, an extraordinary thing has happened to me today. I was shaving, looking at myself in the mirror, when I suddenly realized that I am guilty about sexual things.”

I realized that now that a piece of knowledge had become a personal possession. He was now aware that he was guilty about sexual things. He had had two analyses before coming to see me, and I imagine that either one or both analysts had said to him:

“I think, Roland, you are very guilty about sexual things.”

so he had been repeating to me what had been said to him. Now I understood better what my colleague had said to me some years before. I also came to know that it is no good saying to a patient, “I think you did this out of greed, out of envy or from jealousy.” The patient may know it in the same way that the man “knew” he was guilty about sexual things. Knowledge yes, but dead knowledge.

Now the important point is this. That psycho-analysis had not been occurring with my colleague at the time when his analyst said to him that he had married a mad woman and that analysis had not been occurring with my patient in his previous analyses. As it happened it did occur when he was seeing me, and the question you might ask is what had I done or not done that seemed to enable this act of awareness in my patient and what was it, twenty-five years later, that enabled that act of awareness in my colleague? But I don't want to examine closely now the internal structure of the act of awareness but to stress that psycho-analysis occurs at the moment when there is this inner happening: the moment of awareness. It is this which constitutes not actually the noumenon of psycho-analysis but its phenomenal manifestation.

**FREUD'S METAPSYCHOLOGY**

It was Freud who coined the term “psycho-analysis” so it is natural that we associate the word with his particular formulation. But, on the line of thinking that I am proposing, a word, a name is a phenomenon not the noumenon, not the substance of the thing. We are very easily misled by words. I give two quotes to support this. The first is from a little-known author, Christopher Burney, from his psychological fable Descent from Ararat. The second is from G. K. Chesterton. So this is the first:

I have no objection to people inventing all the words they need. All the fun in talking and speculation comes from seeing whether you can fit words in to fill gaps in your knowledge. But people get into...
bad habits. They turn words into things; they pretend they're sticks and beat people with them; and when a word has acquired enough status it actually has the power to hurt. (Burney, 1962, p. 36)

The quote from Chesterton (1933) is where he is saying that words accrete to themselves certain atmospheres:

Atmosphere ought not to affect these absolutes of the intellect; but it does…. We cannot quite prevent the imagination from remembering irrelevant associations, even in the abstract sciences like mathematics. (p. 180)

So the word “psycho-analysis” can mislead us. Freud (1919) himself referred to this phenomenon as “psycho-synthesis” at one point:

In actual fact, indeed, the neurotic patient presents us with a torn mind, divided by resistances. As we analyze it and remove the resistances, it grows together; the great unity which we call his ego fits into itself all the instinctual impulses which before had been split off and held apart from it. The psycho-synthesis is thus achieved during analytic treatment without our intervention, automatically and inevitably. We have created the conditions for it by breaking up the symptoms into their elements and by removing the resistances. It is not true that something in the patient has been divided into its components and is now quietly waiting for us to put it somehow together again. (p. 161)

Therefore the term “psycho-analysis” is a description of one aspect of which “psycho-synthesis” is another. The process might have been called psycho-synthesis. Either the word “psycho-analysis” or “psycho-synthesis” would have represented only one aspect of the process. The term “psycho-analysis” therefore is part of the process. It belongs therefore to the phenomenon not to the noumenon—the noumenon, because it is unknowable cannot be known through the senses. Therefore to make the word “psycho-analysis” into it, into the substance, is falsifying the very essence of psycho-analysis. We are concerned to know the substance of which the term “psycho-analysis” is only a part. We continue to use the term “psycho-analysis” to mean one particular manifestation of the noumenon, realizing, however, that the word already plays a part in a distortion: making a particular into the whole. Falsity arises when there is an exclusion of part; truth when all parts are included.1

Freud makes the point that this integrating work which he calls psycho-synthesis is something achieved without the analyst's intervention. My colleague who became aware many years later that earlier in life he had married a mad woman achieved this awareness without any intervention from his analyst yet referred to this moment as “real analysis,” showing that he believed that this moment of inner realization, inner awareness, was what constituted analysis.

This gives us a very different perspective on what psycho-analysis is. It implies that it comprises a series of moments of self-awareness that have been generated from some external happening combined with an internal one. I am now going to restrict the external happening. It may not be a valid restriction but it will help, I think, to discipline our thinking and discussion and keep it within the perimeter of interpersonal relations. So the restriction is this: that the external happening that brings about the inner moment of awareness is the relationship to totality channeled through the agency of a person other than myself. I need to explain myself more deeply.

1 “I shall therefore close the discussion by assuming there is a central
abstraction unknown because unknowable yet revealed in an impure form in statements such as ‘container or contained’ and that it is to the central abstraction alone that the term ‘psycho-analytical element’ can be properly applied or the sign ♀♂ allocated” (Bion, 1963/1989, p. 7).
The fundamental fact is existence itself. There is existence and nothing outside of existence so I am part of it; a minute part but nevertheless part of it. There is a past history of the world stretching back for three million years of “hominid” life and stretching back 500 million years of animate life and there is a forward stretch for many millions of years. We are all here in this tiny slice of time. Minute though it is, yet I am part of it. It is this which is my undoubted inheritance. I am part of this vast greatness but I am not crushed by it but, being part of it, I am endowed with nobility but … do I need to do anything to salvage it from being some arcane piece of philosophical abstraction? Yes, an inner creative act through which I become what is. Paul Tillich (1973) emphasized this thus:

Be what you are—that is the only thing one can ask of any being. One cannot ask of a being to be something it was not before. It is as if life in all its forms desires to be asked, to receive demands. But no life can receive demands for something which it is not. It wants to be asked to become what it is and nothing else. This seems surprising but a little thought shows us that it is true.

We know that one cannot ask fruits from thorns, or grain from weeds, or water from a dry fountain, or love from a cold heart, or courage from a cowardly mind or strength from a weak life. If we ask such things from beings who do not have them, we are foolish; and either they will laugh at us or condemn us as unjust and hostile towards them. We can ask of anything or anyone only to bring forth what he has, to become what he is. Out of what is given to us we can act. Receiving precedes acting. (p. 118)

This is why Bion said in one of his Brazilian lectures that the psycho-analyst’s task was to introduce the patient to himself. To make this congruent with what has been said about alpha function or the inner creative principle means that to be who I am requires this creative act to occur.

It is this that Bion meant by becoming O. This is the human task. This is achieved by phenomenal acts which allow O to be. This is never achieved but is an ongoing process of “movement towards.” This progressive series of inner acts through which I become what is—this is psycho-analysis. The word I use to refer to this immensity of which I am a part is totality. I use this word because it suggests that there is nothing outside of it. It embraces the whole universe both outwardly and inwardly. It is the substance of my inwardness and also of my outer being. The analyst and the patient are together a small part of this totality. Volume is a reality. It was created by Archimedes. It is not an idea but a mental reality. One person in relation to another is also a mental reality; it is not an idea. It is real but devoid of any physical characteristics

It is relation to totality that establishes awareness. I can hear you all saying, “What on earth does this idiot mean?” What has happened when we become aware? Let me give you an example. An intelligent and cultured man avoided intimacy with the opposite sex. Why? It was not clear until he propositioned a woman whom he knew had not done further education and had a job as clerical assistant in a government office. He also knew that she was closely involved with a young man who was an electrician whom she saw regularly. So he propositioned her and … guess what? She rejected him and he felt lonely. At that moment he knew he had been lonely all his life but now he was aware of it. Loneliness was now a companion whose shape he could feel. This awareness had come about through a relationship that he had with another man. On this occasion this other man was a psycho-analyst. But the psycho-analyst was not giving him any instructions. He did not say to him, “I think you are lonely, you know.” It was the analyst's state of mind which
enabled this man to become aware of his loneliness. He came to realize that the reason why he had propositioned this woman was to enable him to become aware of his loneliness.
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The analyst's relation to totality brought him into communion with his fellow human beings. His patient entered into this communion and this diminished his loneliness. “But haven't I just said that he became aware of loneliness so how can it be that loneliness is diminished?”

When I start to feel something it means that it has changed its status. The loneliness was there before but in a different state. It is not in fact correct to call it loneliness until it is felt. It was there but in a different form. Bion said that there is pain which is not felt, guilt which is not experienced. He is right that these things were there but they were not there as individual existents but rather guilt, shame, pain, loneliness, jealousy, greed were there as a compacted entity. As the person begins to become himself in relation, this person to this person—Max to Neville—not patient to analyst so within that person different entities start to separate out—loneliness is one kind of pain, guilt is another, shame another, and as they separate out so also they begin to be felt. A feeling is of a separate individual component of a greater totality. It is that these different entities—loneliness, guilt, and shame—have been congealed and now the creative principle has fashioned them into separate realities of which the person is now aware. We speak of them as “unconscious” but we often seem to suppose that they have been in existence but just out of sight, as it were, but in fact they are “unconscious” because they did not exist. They have come into existence through the act of creation.

The *noumenon* of psycho-analysis is *who you are* and the *phenomena* are the acts through which I become who I am. The *process of becoming who I am* occurs in many different ways. Defining psycho-analysis as the *process of becoming who I am* has therefore two components: the *who I am* component and the *process of becoming* component. The *who I am* is the phenomenal manifestation of the *noumenon*; the *process of becoming* is the *phenomenon* which can occur in many different ways. So there is *noumenon* and many different *phenomena*. Visiting an analyst, lying on the couch, fifty-minute session, several sessions a week, making interpretations is one *phenomenon*. It is a particular historical culture-bound *phenomenon*. There are numerous other phenomena. I can only become who I am by freeing myself of chains that imprison me. The *noumenon* is who I am. What obscures it are *phenomena* that claim to be the *noumenon*. Freedom and the creative principle are the key phenomena through which the *noumenon* can be reached. “Becoming who we are” seems a contradiction. Yet Freud said that the sign of a successful analysis is when a patient says at the end of the “formal analysis” that he had always known what had been revealed. It is common to hear someone say, “I know but now I know that I know.” This seems to be a tautology but it is not. It means that there is a reality that has been there but uncreated; when it is created then I know that I know. The word “truly” means that the individual's whole being is now engaged in what is known; that the piece of knowledge which was at the periphery of the field of knowledge is now at the center.

William James (1901–2/1971) gave lucid expression to this:

If you ask of psychology just *how* … and *why* aims that were peripheral become at a certain moment central, psychology has to reply that although she can give a general description of what happens, she is unable in a given case to account accurately for all the single forces at work. Neither an outside observer nor the Subject who undergoes the process can explain fully how particular experiences are able to change one's center of energy so decisively, or why they so often have to bide their hour to do so. We have a thought, or we perform an act, repeatedly, but on a certain day the real meaning of the thought peals through us for the first time, or the act has suddenly turned into a moral impossibility. All we know is
that there are dead feelings, dead ideas, and cold beliefs, and there are hot and live ones; and when one grows hot and alive within us, everything has to re-crystallize about it. (p. 201)
To avoid confusion I use the word “knowledge” to refer to something that is there but existing in a detached uncommitted way or, to use William James's more expressive language, “dead ideas and cold beliefs” and “awareness” being “hot and alive”—when I allow this newfound heat to govern my inner thoughts and outer conduct. So the phenomenon is this process of allowing the noumenon in the particular form of “awareness,” hot and alive, to become the governing principle within the personality.

THE FREEDOM BELIEF AND THE TWO MODES OF CONNECTING

Rousseau believed, as did Karl Marx, as did Freud, that it is cultural structures that imprison us. What Freud added to Rousseau and to Marx was that the cultural organization enters into the individual mind in a form which he named the super-ego. What all three share is the belief that what is imprisoning is the external structure into which every human being is born and is subject to. “Man is born free but is everywhere in chains,” said Rousseau. Psycho-analysis is concerned with the chains which are internal and interpersonal.

What are the chains from which psycho-analysis frees the individual? It is from two joint though interconnected realities: outward isolation and inner disunity. This condition is a correlate of attachment. Psycho-analysis is a process which fosters outer relating and inner cohesion. This is the correlate of being in relation rather than attached. The transformation from attachment to being in relation is usually referred to as “emotional development” but this term has been so used, if not abused, that it ceases to have any meaning. These two actualities—outer relating and inner cohesion—are a single thing seen from two different perspectives. Someone is free when internal parts are in relation to each other and, at the same time, the whole person in relation to other persons, to the world, to the institutions of the culture.

There is a huge difference between being attached to a doctrine and being in relation to it. In the first case I am dominated by the doctrine and in the second I am in relation to it and am a free being. Blind attachment leads to the confusional states referred to as neurotic or psychotic. The connection is either outer stuck to outer or the inner creative core in relation to the inner core of the other. So one might be in slavish attachment to a law or in relation to a law.2 Ethics arises not from slavish attachment to a law but the nature of the judgments that enter into the relationship to a law or a set of laws.

The chain that imprisons is attachment; the agent that frees is relating. Therefore psycho-analysis is the work of transforming attachment into relationship. Attachment is bound by time and place. Relationship is rooted in the totality which is not located in time or space.

Greed, envy, jealousy, and omnipotence are symptoms—signs that attachment has not been transformed into relationship. The clinician, therefore, seeing these as signs of an underlying dysfunction, needs to address this and not the sign that points to it.

Psychological or philosophical positions are generated either by the attachment mode or by the relational mode. The attachment mode is responsible for the philosophical position taken by Freud (1930):

We … turn to the … question of what men themselves show by their behaviour to be the purpose and intention of their lives. What do they demand of life and wish to achieve in it? The answer to this

2 “That we should obey laws good or bad is a new fangled notion” — Gandhi (Tidrick, 2000, p. 91).
can hardly be in doubt. They strive after happiness; they want to become happy and to remain so. The endeavour has two sides, a positive and negative aim. It aims, on the one hand, at an absence of pain and unpleasure, and, on the other, at the experiencing of strong feelings of pleasure. (p. 76)

Pleasure and pain are correlates of touch, of attachment. So, it is important to realize that in Freud himself there are those insights of genius which germinated psycho-analysis, its very substance, but also there are background beliefs to which he was attached which betray psycho-analysis, betray his own insights. Freud was schooled at Brücke's Institute in Vienna, and he was passionately attached to it. The significance of this can be made clear if I quote to you from Ernest Jones's (1972) biography of Freud:

Brücke's Institute was an important part indeed of that far-reaching scientific movement best known as Helmholtz's School of Medicine. The amazing story of this scientific school started in the early forties with the friendship of Emil Du Bois-Reymond (1818–96) and Ernst Brücke (1819–92), soon joined by Hermann Helmholtz (1821–94) and Carl Ludwig (1816–95). From its very beginning this group was driven forward by a crusading spirit. In 1842 Du Bois-Reymond wrote: “Brücke and I pledged a solemn oath to put into effect this truth: No other forces than the common physical and chemical ones are active within the organism. In those cases which cannot at the time be explained by those forces one has either to find the specific way or form of their action by means of the physical-mathematical method or to assume new forces equal in dignity to the chemical-physical forces inherent in matter, reducible to the force of attraction and repulsion. (Jones, 1972, p. 45)

The relational mode, on the other hand, has spawned a philosophical position expressed thus:

Freedom is, I am assured, the pearl of great price for which, if we are wise, we shall be prepared to sell all our possessions, to buy it. The ancient and widespread belief that the supreme good of human life is happiness—for all its persuasiveness—is false. Freedom has a higher value than happiness; and this is what we recognize when we honour those who have been ready to sacrifice happiness, and even life itself, for freedom's sake. (MacMurray, 1949, p. 2)

Tragedy and joy are correlates of vision, of relating.

If you follow the Freud, disciple of Brücke, you must be consistent and not, for instance, erect compassion into a human goal. Compassion means to “suffer with” another, but this is painful and is inconsistent with Freud's human goal. There is much twisting and turning in the official literature falsely named “psycho-analytic” which attempts to attach moral goals to Freud's view. One might ask why Freud was so determinedly committed to the view just quoted. He was attached to this view rather than being in relation to it. Since working in Brücke's neurological laboratory in Vienna he was unfailingly attached, almost addicted, to this view. This unfree philosophy also governed his definition of the ego:

The ego is subject to the influence of the instincts, too, like the id, of which it is, as we know, only a specially modified part. (Freud, 1923, p. 40)

To be in relation requires an inference that the ego is not an attribute of the Id but an inner creative principle in its own right which came to birth at the dawn of civilization and at that point in evolution became the foundation stone of what makes this particular animal into what we know as homo
sapiens. There are deep phantasies that govern schools of thinking. Some are false; some are true or closer to the truth. I believe that the phantasy governing Freud's view of the human goal is false; the other one I believe is true, as long as Freud's view is not excluded.
Distortion occurs not so much when a particular viewpoint is emphasized but when this excludes an essential vertex, to use one of Bion's terms. It is exclusion that leads to distortion of reality. So when I speak of the creative principle being at the source of personality it is necessary to place this within the communicative medium of the reality shared in by human beings worldwide. The point that the creative principle is at the core of the personality does not exclude the “will to live” which characterizes all living beings including humans but that there is in humans this creative principle that is the fashioner of mental realities. No dog, or even a primate, can create volume, create a relation or create O.

Differing beliefs concerning the goal of human desire cannot be proved. They are held even as deeply as the fiercest religious belief. I would not try to dissuade someone from Freud's belief anymore than I would try to dissuade someone from his belief in Communism, Freemasonry, Christianity, Buddhism, Judaism, or Neo-conservatism. It is wasted breath. I would conserve my energy for the task of understanding what it means to be in relation. The philosopher Collingwood (1969) understood the power of such beliefs when he said,

They give people more than a touch of the feeling which Rudolph Otto called numinous terror. (p. 46)

There is terror of abandoning such a belief. If I do so I fall into empty space. Being attached to a belief which is untrue falsifies by making what is a phenomenon into the noumenon. This is how a whole group, organized around a false belief, can make a particular phenomenon into the noumenon. Official declarations from the IPA embody such a false group belief. Hence the futile discussions on whether five times a week or four times a week or three times a week or twice a week or once a week constitute an analysis. To be faithful to the noumenon there has to be present the state of in relation to totality and this is combined with a process of freeing from imprisoning chains. If any aspect of the phenomenon is made absolute, is fashioned into the totality, then the noumenon has been betrayed. There is a particular danger of the analyst making the relation to him or herself the end point. What leads to growth of heart and mind are statements that encompass the relation to totality. It is not pointing out what should be but what already is. The word “psycho-analysis” is part of the phenomenon. It is only one aspect of the process—it is that part in which the analyst has a role but there is another part which finds its source within the patient.

THE RELATION BETWEEN THE INTRAPSYCHIC AND INTERPERSONAL

Interpersonal refers to the way in which one human being relates to another. Intrapsychic refers to the way in which the different parts within the personality connect to each other.

The way in which a human being relates to another is mirrored by the manner in which different parts within the personality relate to each other. The interpersonal and the intrapsychic correlate with each other.

SECONDARY FACTORS

It is common for psycho-analysis to be defined by the following elements: the presence of a professional person who has done a training at a psychoanalytic institute together with someone
designated a patient; the patient frequently lying on a couch; the two meeting for several times a week each time for a period a little less than an hour—these meetings known as “sessions” and these to take place for thirty-eight to forty-five weeks a year and for several years. As these external events neither tell us whether the individual is in relation to totality or whether there be a process of psychic acts freeing the individual from the chains of attachment then they do not tell us whether psycho-analysis is occurring or not. There is no indication, or in fact guarantee, that there is a psycho-analysis happening.

I have met and come to know several psycho-analysts, especially in recent years, who did not train at a psycho-analytic institute. It is worth remembering something Bion (1974) said,

My experiences of psycho-analytic training were, in fact, very depressing. Like the first railway coaches which were made to look as much like horse-drawn vehicles as possible, I found the whole apparatus of training was just a copy of the methods suitable for conventional training in conventional experience. But as I became more and more acquainted with psycho-analysis, the more utterly unsuitable this seemed. (p. 211)

I am in entire sympathy with his sentiments here. I believe the trainings now offered at the official psycho-analytic institutes frequently falsify psycho-analysis. It is mostly an educational system, like the railway carriages looking like horse-drawn vehicles, a syllabus suitable for academic learning but not psycho-analysis. I am fully in favor of education but learning the thinking of Freud, of Jung, of Klein, of Kohut, of Winnicott may win me a prize awarded by the IPA but it is not psycho-analysis. The reason I say this is that the analyst is then not seeing directly but through the lens of one of these mentors. No one has given more perspicacious expression to this than the art connoisseur, Bernard Berenson (1954):

the most difficult thing in the world is to see clearly and with one's own eyes, naïvely…. . Only when a person is to become an artist is a systematic effort made to teach him. But note how it is done…. He was set to copy simple drawings of his own master, or of other artists. Then the antique was put before him, and he had to copy that. By this time his habits of vision were well on the way to becoming fixed, and, unless he were endowed with unusual powers of reacting against teaching, he passed the rest of his life seeing in objects only those shapes and forms that the drawings and antiques put before him had pointed out to him…. And, unless years devoted to the study of all schools of art have taught us to see with our own eyes, we soon fall into the habit of moulding whatever we look at into the forms borrowed from the one art with which we are acquainted. (p. 211)

If we do not see directly, in the way that Berenson recommends, then we are very likely to mould the patient according to a moulding of which we ourselves are victim. Fifty minutes is quite arbitrary; it seems a reasonable period of time and suits some people but not others. With a very disturbed patient Herbert Rosenfeld would sit them up and see them for an hour and a quarter. For some patients fifty minutes is not sufficient. Freud used to see his patients six times a week; a psycho-analyst in London saw a patient seven times a week. Winnicott used to see Guntrip twice a month. Another analyst sees a patient for a two-hour session once every ten weeks. All these patients were in analysis. An analysis occurs occasionally through one single meeting. A process of analyst meeting with a patient five times a week can continue for twenty years without an analysis happening.

Psycho-analysis is not a science but an art. Like all art there are scientific
principles within it. You may ask how I differentiate science and art? Science is the study of the principles that
govern the world of objects. Art is the form of communication between human beings. Therefore when those ancestors of ours began to paint in those caves of Altamira, Lascaux, or Chauvet we recognize that the beings who did this are not hominids but beings like ourselves—homo sapiens.

TRUE PHENOMENA

An analysis begins prior to the patient coming for his first meeting with the analyst and an analysis continues after the last meeting with the analyst. I saw my analyst for my last session thirty-five years ago. I have been in analysis for those thirty-five years. What needs to be present for this to occur? A series of emotional actions seems to be the answer. Each such action frees the individual of imprisoning chains. There are also actions with imprison further. Actions which imprison further are acts of submissive attachment. Such submission crushes the inner creative spirit. A friend from overseas, in analysis four times a week, who believed he had been in analysis for some years wrote recently to me thus:

And I know I was analysed for many years, and allowed myself to be analysed, without being in analysis. Now I know sometimes that I am in psychoanalysis and that it is so different from being analysed. I really have a feel of life and living. (personal communication)

Submitive attachment means a crushing of the creative principle, his ego. This action then is imprisoning. The action which frees does so because it is in relation to totality which is larger, greater than the creative principle itself. The totality nurtures and expands the creative principle. The object loved either shrinks or expands the ego depending upon whether it is sensual and particular or mental and total.

I give you now four examples of true analysis happening:

A woman in India was in great distress as her newborn baby died. She was advised to go to a guru who said to her “Collect five mustard seeds from the household where there has been no death or misfortune.” She went from house to house but in every one there had been either a death or a tragedy. Then she realized that the guru had set her this task so now she understood through her own investigation that what had happened to her was part of the universal suffering of humankind.

A young man in Australia resented his wife because when he came home from work she expected him to feed and tend their two young children. He approached a guru to whom he said that he was a follower of the Gospel of Christ and had striven all his life to be perfect and so he deserved to be looked after and cared for by his wife. The guru pointed out to him that in St. Matthew's Gospel it is reported that Jesus said “Be ye perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect” but that in a parallel passage St. Luke said “Be ye merciful as your heavenly Father is merciful.” The young man went home and had two joint realizations: that he had been expecting all his married life to be looked after by his wife as though he were a baby and perfect and now he had the liberating thought that it was his role to care for his wife; the second insight was that his wife was not deliberately being a bad mother but did not know how to be a mother, having been abandoned by her own mother in childhood.

The President of the State seduced the wife of one of the generals in the army. Then, wanting her for himself, he ordered the general to attack an enemy position. He made sure that this general
was likely to be killed which he was. Later the President became depressed so he consulted a guru who said to him:

In the same town were two men, one rich, the other poor. The rich man had flocks and herds in great abundance; the poor man had nothing but a ewe lamb, one only, a small one he had bought. This he fed, and it grew up with him and his children, eating his bread, drinking from his cup, sleeping on his breast; it was like a daughter to him. When there came a traveller to stay, the rich man refused to take one of his own flock or herd to provide for the wayfarer who had come to him. Instead he took the poor man's lamb and prepared it for his guest.” The President flared up in fury against the man. “I swear to God,” he said to the guru, “the man who did this deserves to die! He must make fourfold restitution for the lamb, for doing such a thing and showing no compassion.” Then the guru said to the President, “You are the man.”

An elderly man in Australia believed his father had ruined his life. His father had long since died. He approached a guru who pointed out that it was now no longer his father who was ruining his life but an inner representation of his father. Taking a cue from the guru he called this representation “my inner despot.” One day he realized that his father also suffered from the presence of an inner despot. He felt sad for his father and took a new interest in his wife and in his children.

I have given here examples of four different gurus. They were all practicing psycho-analysts. The first one is known as Siddhartha Gautama or more commonly known as The Buddha. This was 2,500 years ago. The second one was a Catholic priest in contemporary Australia. The third one was the prophet Nathan, a good Kleinian analyst, giving an interpretation to King David 3,000 years ago. The fourth guru was a psycho-analyst practising in Australia currently.

Psycho-analysis, as named by Freud, is one historical incarnation of this *noumenon*. It has had other names in different cultures as these examples illustrate. It first came into existence in what Karl Jaspers called The Axial Era—the period between 2,800 and 2,200 years ago. In this period we locate The Buddha, Mahavira, the Hebrew prophets, Zarathustra, Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle.

Psycho-analysis exists already in India, in China, in Africa, and in Russia just as analysis exists already in the patient before she comes for her first session. Before the analyst arrives in India, China, Africa, or Russia the analysis is already happening. The job of the analyst arriving there is to locate the phenomena of the culture that represent it. Psycho-analysis is a revelation of what is already there. Its form of expression will differ according to the culture. It is a kind of missionary tyranny to impose upon a culture something that is not there. It reminds me of Walt Whitman's profound remark when he said, “All music is what awakes in you when you are reminded by the instruments” (*MacNeile Dixon, 1958*, p. 408). In a new culture the analyst's task is to awaken what is already there.

Only by having the *noumenon* of psycho-analysis at the center of our being will we see that growth of mind, that freedom from imprisoning chains, that humans in all parts of the world deeply desire.
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